

REMARKS

Claims 7, 8, and 11 through 20 were presented for examination and rejected, and claim 7 has been amended. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendment and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection of Claims 7, 8, and 11 through 20

Claims 7, 8, and 11 through 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Independent claim 7 has been amended, and the applicants wish to thank Examiner Tra for his helpful insight in this matter. In particular, claim 7 has been amended to properly label the inputs of operational amplifier 305. For this reason, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome.

Because claims 8 and 11 through 20 depend on claim, 7, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is also overcome.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 7, 8, 11, and 13 through 16

Claims 7, 8, 11, and 13 through 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been rejected as being anticipated by P.M. Mosinskis, et al., US Patent: 6,529,563, issued March 4, 2003 (hereinafter "Mosinskis"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 7, as currently presented, recites:

7. An apparatus comprising:

a bandgap reference voltage generator having an output terminal;

an operational amplifier having a positive input terminal, a negative input terminal, and an output terminal, wherein the negative input terminal of said operational amplifier is electrically connected to the output terminal of said bandgap reference voltage generator;

a transistor having a gate, a source, and a drain, wherein the gate of said transistor is electrically connected to the output of said operational amplifier, and wherein the drain of said transistor is electrically connected to the positive input terminal of said operational amplifier;

a voltage divider having a input terminal, an output terminal, and a common terminal, wherein said input terminal of said voltage divider is electrically connected to the positive input terminal of said operational amplifier;

a startup network having a first positive supply terminal and an output terminal, wherein said output terminal of said startup network is electrically connected to said input terminal of said voltage divider; and

a self-biasing network having a second positive supply terminal, a common terminal, and an output terminal, wherein said second positive supply terminal of said self-biasing network is electrically connected to said output terminal of said startup network, and wherein said common terminal of said self-biasing network is electrically connected to said common terminal of said voltage divider.

(emphasis supplied)

Nowhere does Mosinskis teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 7 recites – namely that **the positive supply terminal of a self-biasing network is electrically connected to the output terminal of a startup network, AND that the positive supply terminal of the self-biasing network is electrically connected to the INPUT of a voltage divider.**

As shown in Figure 3 of Mosinskis, Mosinskis **DOES** show a self-biasing network (334, 350, 354, and 344) that has a positive supply terminal (positive input of Opamp2 (334)) that is electrically connected to the output terminal of a startup network (378 and 374). Mosinskis **DOES NOT**, however, show a self-biasing network that has a positive supply terminal that is electrically connected to the **INPUT** of a voltage divider. Instead, Mosinskis shows that the positive supply terminal (*i.e.*, the positive input of Opamp2 (334)) of the self-biasing network is connected to the **OUTPUT** of the voltage divider (*i.e.*, the junction of resistors R3 and R4).

The Office Action asserts that the connection of positive supply terminal of the self-biasing network to the output terminal of the startup network via resistor R3 reads on the claim language "electrically connected." This interpretation is untenable.

It would be clear to those skilled in the art in general, and from its consistent and clear usage in the present application that the term "electrically connected" means at the same potential for substantially any current (*i.e.*, "shorted"). Furthermore, the Office Action's interpretation of "electrically connected":

- is inconsistent with the meaning of "electrically connected" as consistently used by the Office throughout the rest of its remarks and analysis;
- renders D.C. circuit analysis meaningless, since every "electrically-connected" component in a circuit would be considered shorted to every other component; and
- ignores the functionality of voltage divider 309, thereby negating its purpose.

The applicant asserts that the functionality of the voltage divider, as used by Mosinskis, is fundamentally different than the functionality of the voltage divider, as used in the present invention – as evinced by the distinct differences in the connectivity of the voltage dividers within their respective circuits. For this reason, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 7 is traversed.

Because claims 8, 11, and 13 through 16 depend upon claim 7, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of them are also v.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 17 through 19

Claims 17 through 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over P.M. Mosinskis in view of Connell, et al., U.S. Patent 6,441,594, issued August 27, 2002 (hereinafter "Connell").


Claims 17 through 19 are dependent upon claim 7. Because Connell fails to cure the deficiency of Mosinskis with respect to claim 7, the applicant respectfully submits the rejection of them is traversed.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the Office action mailed January 7, 2005, applicants request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

Should there remain unresolved issues the applicant respectfully requests that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney at 732-578-0103 x11 so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
DeMont & Breyer, LLC

By 
Jason Paul DeMont
Reg. No. 35793
Attorney for Applicants
732-578-0103 x11

Date 3/15/05

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733